

Mr. Nyland speaking to the California Society for Psychical Study

February 27, 1968

Berkeley

? : I'll call the meeting to order. The first order of business is a very short business meeting, and then we'll get to other things. I announced last month there will be a vote by the members to turn the meeting over to Jess Paula (indiscernable talk).

Jess Paula: A few months ago I talked about some of the ideas of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky. And I told the audience at the time that what I knew about was second and third hand. Tonight we have the pleasure of having Mr. Nyland with us, and the best introduction I can offer to you is the fact that he was working with Gurdjieff for twenty five years until his death in 1949. So Mr. Nyland will discuss some of the philosophy and ideas of Gurdjieff. Mr. Nyland.

Mr. Nyland: Well, since you heard Jess already some time ago talk about Gurdjieff and Ouspensky maybe you have questions of a certain kind; if you have then maybe we start with that. Or is it an entirely new subject?

Audience: I think this is an entirely new audience.

Mr. Nyland: So we'll have to assume nobody knows about Gurdjieff . . . or Ouspensky.

Audience: Oh no, I think we all know about Ouspensky.

Mr. Nyland: Oh good, we start with Ouspensky, we end up with Gurdjieff. The difficulty is always what we expect really, because if Gurdjieff is just a name and Ouspensky perhaps a person you happen to know from In Search of the Miraculous, my question is how many of the ideas in the book stuck with you? In short, the idea is simply that man as he is at the present time is not complete and that he could have the possibility for completing particularly his con-

sciousness and also could develop a conscience. It is to a certain extent to find by means of a philosophy a way of life and a preparation for man to fulfill whatever his functions may be on earth. Having in mind that in doing this he will be more complete, or what Gurdjieff calls becoming an harmonious man, and for that reason fulfill an obligation he has simply because he happens to be on earth. In order to introduce this as a possibility for man when he wishes to become conscious, he has to have certain attributes which do not exist on earth at the present time. And if earth as man as he is represents a subjective manifestation that that what is needed for man is to acquire the possibility of becoming objective. Objective regarding himself, primarily.

And in trying to find out how he could become objective, Gurdjieff has laid down certain "rules", you might say; a certain method which indicates that man, if he could follow that, could become a conscious man. The reason, of course, for that is that Gurdjieff considers man as he is at the present time, when he is walking around, that he is in a waking-sleeping state. And that for him the possibility of self-consciousness exists. And also that after self-consciousness, it could even become cosmic consciousness. But whatever that is now, that man as he is now could become something else. That is if man exists and could continue to exist after he dies physically, that then what is left of such a person could continue to develop even on a higher level of being.

And that the ultimate aim of man would be to become free and to understand what is really meant by the totality of all things existing as he now represents in the form of life that he calls himself. So the purpose simply is to try to have better understanding of man in the first place as he is on earth, and in the second place, that

if he doesn't like the condition in which he is, that there might be a possibility for him to become free from that what he is, and that way sever or disconnect the bondage of earth. Naturally it's a kind of philosophy for a man that could become a religion if he then fulfills these particular tasks or these ideas, and tries to follow them then in that freedom, he would find aim for his own existence. And in trying to do this while he's still on earth, that during such a period he will understand life on earth better. And would be able to function more like a man should function.

The idea underlying all of this is naturally that man as he is now is simply potentially what he should become, and that what he is actually is only half what he really could become if he knew how to develop. By "half", he simply means that man now consists of a physical body, that he has, of course, a certain feeling which Gurdjieff calls a center, and that as far as his intellect is concerned, is very little developed and that it is necessary for him ultimately to develop again what Gurdjieff calls three full-grown bodies of which the physical is practically developed up to the point where he goes over into death (physically); that emotionally he's only half way developed; intellectually it's to such a small extent that it's practically for purposes of objectivity he doesn't have very much of a need.

If you understand the question of how such development of bodies can take place and you can understand something about an octave and how the development in an octave indicates a progress of a man as he is growing, then man, physically speaking, is complete up to the si of a particular octave. That his emotional life, starting with do, only goes up to re and mi, and that the fa bridge of that octave is not as yet gone over into the second possible development of that

what belongs to that octave which is so - la - si. And that intellectually man is only at do. So you have to distinguish between that what is man on earth and for which he perhaps was born to fulfill a certain function, and that what man could become potentially.

And when we talk about possible growth of a man (of evolution in a certain ~~function~~ sense that man completes himself), it only has to do with what really should be the ultimate aim of man if he understands life. And that for the sake of living on earth no such development is really necessary because each person as he is on earth is sufficiently well-equipped to be able to live. So when we talk about that it becomes philosophically a necessity of seeing what is the aim of man as is, it's further than just being a human being on earth. A So anyone who believes that this life is simply a question between conception and death, and that nothing else exists after that, of course for them Gurdjieff has absolutely no meaning whatever.

Now the question. . . . It would be easier now if you actually understood now what I'm saying because we can go many different directions in talking about this kind of work. If you're interested to know what man should do, that is, how can he, as he is at the present time, 100 percent subjective, become objective in a certain sense, and what will be the result for him? If that is a question of now knowing what to do, man then as he is has to acquire a certain faculty which he doesn't possess. And this faculty we simply call objective. That is, he has to learn to be able to contemplate or to observe himself in a certain way so that that what he receives as facts about himself are unquestionably the truth and nothing else but the truth. So there is no conflict and no interference in this intellectual perception. This we will call objective because it will give us facts of an abso-

lute kind about which people would not argue, and a person for himself would not argue either because he would be completely convinced that that is the truth for him.

As it is at the present time, when man contemplates himself he has ideas what he is and what he hopes to be; and if he sees certain things he doesn't like, he rationalizes about it because he doesn't want to face the truth as it really is. This is an indication of his subjectivity. The reason why man should become free from himself is simply to loosen the bondage that he has now with earth, and to which he is bound. And you might say to a certain extent this kind of work has to do with a preparation for man so that when he dies he will not have the difficulty of fear & for death, for that death simply means an entry into a new form of existence which may be on a different or a higher level than he is at the present time. Simply to say that what is work on oneself as it is called by Gurdjieff is the acquisition of this objective faculty. It is a way of man, we call it "observing himself", in his manifestations, in which then such facts are registered in a certain part of his brain, which then registers without any description or without any liking or dislike.

If you understand that, it simply means that man is made up of three different centers. They are called an intellectual one which we can understand because the brain is in the head and is more a center than anything else. We must talk about a physical center. It is not a center, it is totality of his body in which different organs, of course, function. And when it's a question of an emotional or a feeling center, also that is not sharply defined because the feeling is not concentrated enough in one place. It is partly in the solar plexus and partly in different nerve nodes which are distributed over the rest of his body. But it is not proper functioning as yet of an

emotional kind, and therefore we make a distinction between feeling which belongs to the solar plexus and is needed for man as he lives on earth, and his emotion which will give him the possibility of living in a different atmosphere than earth only. And the emotions then would be centered in his heart, as the real place where his emotional life should be.

So if I now say that if man should develop this objective faculty about himself it would be a registration in his mind of facts which are so, and unquestionably always are so, and which would become permanent in knowledge for him. That is, it should be registered without any interference of this feeling or emotional center. It should be truth for him; there should not be any like or dislike. Also these facts should be registered in such a way that there is no further association of an intellectual kind connected with it.

So this leads to three requirements for man if he wants to follow this kind of a method for possible development of his consciousness; that is, he has to observe, to learn to observe, to learn to be able to accept facts as he sees them then. By seeing, I simply mean there's a certain form of mental activity which is called an awareness of himself, which awafulness, if it could be continued, would be described as a state of being awake. And that in that he should be impartial in the registration of such facts and that impartiality only can be reached when he understands that that what takes place in a moment of existence can only give him true data about himself without any associations.

Now I don't want to go too far into the detail of that particular way of how to work. For that is a description of the method for man if he actually is interested in the development of his consciousness. Together with his consciousness he will have to develop

conscience because he will need some kind of a guide in order to put him in a state of becoming, as Gurdjieff says, harmonious; that is, in equilibrium and at peace with himself so that he is able to act as a man should act and then be able to do whatever is required to be done in accordance with his understanding of what is required for such conditions in which he happens to live.

Again I say if you have questions about what we just now talked about, it is much easier to have a discussion . . . because it is rather difficult to just give a little talk about the ideas of Gurdjieff. Guspensky describes a great deal of this in In Search of the Miraculous, and anyone who is interested in it can read it out of that book. But if you want to have the real Gurdjieff of course you should go to the source material which is in a book published by Gurdjieff at the time, and it's called All and Everything. In All and Everything different, you might call them "stories" or metaphysical sayings, or descriptions are given as if Beelzebub is sent to our solar system and on his way back, having performed certain functions which were needed for his own growth, he has talks with his grandson, Hassenin. He tells him then about the different visits Beelzebub has made to the earth for different purposes. The totality of the book of course is allegorical, and at the same time the description is a very interesting one because if one starts to understand what Gurdjieff really means, it is as if Gurdjieff then at such a time is talking to you and describes man as he is. And, of course, one does not always want to believe that what is being written, and for that reason reading the book is not so easy. And if many times you do read it, you will be confronted with long sentences and very much involved, and sometimes you're afraid it is pulling your leg and just makes a joke about it. But when it becomes really a serious matter,

that what is written in that book has such deep meaning for me. And those who really can believe in it or at least have profited by it will consider this kind of book more like scripture than even literature. X

Now the question for Gurdjieff in this kind of a system is very important that that what one now knows as knowledge of what is required to make this objective faculty, is something that when one actually hears what ought to be done, that one actually will do it. And that the proof is the verification of that what he says. That is, unless you want to take these ideas to heart and put them to practice, you will never know what is meant by becoming conscious. So theory will not help you and enjoyment in your mind will not help you. It is the practical application in daily life of that what is meant to become objective regarding oneself which will give you the truth as it is, and that truth will of course set you free.

There will not be many people who are interested in this. Because many will just take it as a little bit of reading matter, and it stays in their mind and perhaps enjoyable and perhaps not so much but to a certain extent understandable. But it will not give you the real knowledge that you need because there's a great deal of difference between the facts that you accumulate in your mind and understanding that belongs to the level of your being.

And the question of being, for Gurdjieff, simply means that man as he is now and as he is incomplete and in many ways of course, he would say, is mechanical, and also unconscious, from the standpoint of self-consciousness, and for such a man the acquisition of knowledge is absolutely needed in order to raise the level of his being to a higher form which in Gurdjieffian terms is called the Keesdjanian level. By Keesdjan, or Body Keesdjan, is meant the possible

development of man in an emotional sense and a completeness of that what is then an emotional body.

The real reason for wanting to work on oneself is to make for oneself a soul. And it is understood that the soul at the present time does not exist in man. It only exists potentially, and the reason for the soul is that if man dies that what is his life can continue as a soul existing, then in different realms which are not of this earth and which we of course consider higher than earth; but in any event are away from earth and in that sense belong much more to the realm of the cosmos or the universe as a whole. And that ultimately these different forms of growing as changing from one form to another will ultimately lead a man to the possibility of understanding infinity. So that the real reason why man wishes to become free is really that he, as living now on earth, can have the ability to become more sure, or more real or more godlike or understanding what he should be even as man as he is on earth.

And that the reason why man on earth is the way he is is simply that earth is in a very unfortunate position regarding what is called the Cosmic Ray. Cosmic Ray is a term used by both Gurdjieff and Ouspensky. Ouspensky explains it a little bit more when he talks about involution and evolution. Involution meaning a current of life being manifested as coming from absolute and extending in space towards the end of that possible octave which is represented as a cosmic ray. So that starting from Absolute as si-do, the next step below that would be si, then la, then sol, then fa, then re, and then mid, then do as the lowest do, which in this sense would become Negative Absolute. And that the earth in this cosmic ray is situated at fa of that particular octave. For that reason, Gurdjieff calls fa, or where earth is, an unfortunate planet. And that the real purpose for everything in the

universe is again to become united with that what is at the center, or rather what is in existence in infinity as the totality of everything existing. And that also as far as the earth is concerned then, all planetary bodies, and in fact all ~~hi~~ bodies as far as the universe is concerned and we know about . . . that all of them will have this tendency of finally becoming united with that what should be infinity everywhere and always. It's rather a difficult concept, and why ~~w~~ should we as human beings bother about it? If it is put on the basis of cosmological events, of course it becomes interesting. But of course it becomes much more practical if actually this is the condition of man as he is, at the present time. And that therefore what Gurdjieff is talking about is really a description of man as he is, even if he talks of the possible evolution of the earth going over ~~the~~ towards the planets as the next level and becoming a real planet. And from the planetary level going over to the solar level as the sun. That is, within our little solar system, and naturally after the solar system it could become one unit in regard to that what exists in the rest of the cosmos.

Again you'd go through the same kind of an evolution as solar system as one unit to all suns, Milky Way, and finally reach the Absolute. I don't want to talk too much about these kind of concepts of finiteness and infinity. They are very difficult and for ordinary man practically not understandable. We don't know anything about omniscience nor omnipotence. All these different properties that are attributed to God and whatever it is meant by Him, we don't even understand "endless", we are constantly affected by what we consider time and time elements in space as well as in time. So really we do not know very much with our ordinary mind and simply the fact that our mind is quite limited and only has certain finiteness, out of which it

is extremely difficult to get to reach a certain state of consciousness.

Exactly that means that if one wants to work on oneself for the purpose of growing or for the purpose of actually evolving to a level where man is, should be and has been when he was born, but is not now anymore . . . that then the application of everything that is being said in Beelzebub book simply applies to man as he is at the present time and that for each man this possibility of a possible development for himself exists, if he only wants to follow certain rules which are laid out and which are then meant by work on oneself. For that man as he is now as a physical body with his feelings and whatever he has as mental functionings represents for himself a certain form of a solar system in which the body of man is compared to earth and which the emotional states are compared to planets and in which the intellect is compared to consciousness, that what is seen for him is his consciousness.

The planetary states, everything that we know about the planets in ordinary life, you might say, that what exists around us are conditions of our emotions. And the planet earth, and the visit of Beelzebub to earth simply means that Beelzebub as a conscious being visits the earth, the earth being that what is physical body in all its manifestations, in order to advise or to help this earth become more fullgrown or understand what is really the condition of it and in that sense help to develop man to become an emotional body on his way to Soul, comparable to the possible developments of earth going through the stages of planets, finally and ultimately becoming sun.

All of this, of course, if you do know a little bit about it, involves the formation of what Gurdjieff calls "I". "I" for a man is simply a means for him to understand how to become objective. What then when one says, "I would like to work on myself and for that

I need some kind of an organ that will function in an objective sense." One can say it in a different way, that I would like to create a little "I" which I endow with the possibility of becoming objective towards me. And that then, in the beginning, it is like a separation - something separated from me in which me is still a that what I am as a personality. And what a creation would become for me is "I", at the present time very small when I start to create it, that I hope that ultimately it will grow up and become then for me a guide so that when man is fullgrown he would have a fully-developed "I".

Again I say these concepts are very difficult because they are extremely strange for anyone who has never believed that such a thing was necessary. Many times we think that with our centers as they are, feeling as well as intellect, that man is sufficiently equipped to go into the kingdom of heaven afterwards. And because of this Gurdjieff, he will not make a soul unless there's something very definitely done to him in the state in which he is at the present time and to bring him from one level of being as represented by earth to a level of being as represented by the planets, certain definite things have to be done. An introduction of that what is needed in order to undo the subjectivity is the concept of objectivity. So that when I wish to create the little "I", it has to have an attribute and represent for me an objective faculty.

The reason I call it a "little I" is simply because it is at the present time not developed; it is small. And also, that in the beginning when I start to think about the possibility of evolution for oneself then that what man is as he is now, hundred percent subjective, the question can be asked: how can he out of that subjectivity create something that is objective? As a matter of fact he doesn't create it so that it already exists even in a very small form.

He creates it in a way that he does as if it is created. And the beginning of the little "I" is the assumption that something exists "as if" it exists. And then I give it, on the basis of a working hypothesis, that I now know that it could function if it existed in a certain way. When I say endowing it with the possibility of becoming objective by to me I now would like to have this little "I" function as if it is recording that what I am in an objective manner. By that again I mean that whatever is observed by this little "I" is accepted for what it is, without any further description or criticism or wishing to change.

And that these facts become objective facts which are then received by the little "I" gradually because of the accumulation of such facts which are objective will enable to change the "as if" condition of the little "I" into the actuality of existence. Again I say this is very difficult to understand. Because I start out with a subjective wish or a subjective concept in my mind as it is at the present time, which of course has to be called unconscious, because I assume that the state of waking is a conscious state and it is called ~~unconsciousness~~ ^{unconsciousness}.

So that now thinking about the possibility of reaching a state of consciousness with my unconscious mind, I have to purify the thoughts and the feelings to the greatest degree that it is possible for it, and use that form of energy for the wish to create something still is considered from my standpoint as an "as if" condition. That of course I can do as a concept. And I can actually, when I wish to create this, do as if it already exists. There is nothing against such an assumption as a working hypothesis until finally that which is now "as if", goes over to the reality of existence and that then what is working hypothesis becomes for me an action.

An action, of course, is for me absolute truth. Because there is nothing as facts which contradict it. As long as I still am working and I accumulate facts which perhaps may not be entirely so, I still have the hypothesis to deal with. As soon as all facts remain absolute for ever and ever then I know that it is axiomatic for me to assume that "I" in actuality exists. And that all that one has to do is to continue on the wish to develop it. One develops one's "I" by giving it work to do. And this work is constantly to try to make this little "I" objective regarding me. By me, I mean now, that what I am in ordinary life, as a personality functioning in whatever state one's consciousness is, ordinary consciousness or unconscious, whatever the state of one's feeling is, whatever the state is of one's physical body.

In developing this little "I", when it receives constantly this wish on my part to function objectively regarding my personality, the little "I" grows up and becomes gradually more and more full-grown. When it is sufficiently fullgrown to stand on its own feet, as it were, it has another task to fulfill. That is the task of the "I" then is to return, as it were, to where it came from, which is my personality, and then help this personality because of its higher insight and wisdom to manifest in a certain way as a result of the introduction of a conscious knowledge into my unconscious knowledge. That is, knowledge of an objective kind which now is introduced into my subjective knowledge.

What applies to one's mind, applies in exactly the same way to one's ~~xxxxxxxx~~ conscience. Only it goes a little bit later; that is, first one starts with an intellectual concept and as that starts to grow, that what takes place parallel to it will be a development of an emotional kind; and that for the necessity of trying to work on one-

self, already at such a time, a relationship must exist between x one's mind, having knowledge of what to do, the body itself, being observed by the mind, and a wish which will continue to introduce into my mind the continued desire, this one thing, to remain observant. Again this forms a little triangle which belongs to man when man as a whole could become complete.

Even if the different centers are not fully completed, there can be a certain form of harmony between that what is there, lopsided as it may be, at least it can be unified, and that the whole purpose of man wanting to create a little "I" depends entirely on the wish for himself to be complete in his desire actually to grow.

Again there are various different ways by which this can be looked at. And I don't want to go too far in detail about it because if you really become interested there are many aspects that will become clear. In the first place that what man could become, that is, if he creates his little "I", that this little "I" will have that kind of a function of first being objective, you might say as if this "I" becomes cold since nothing of a feeling kind can enter. Impartiality means that I am free from feeling. For that afterwards, this "I" wishing to return to help me as a personality, uses what was inherent in it, a certain form of benevolence of wishing to return to that out of which it was created.

So that the function of man then ultimately would be to develop a consciousness parallel to that of conscience in order to guide him and furnish the energy for the continued wish to remain conscious regarding himself and also in the execution of that what he thinks this time consciously, or what he feels, or rather emotionally is aware of as a representation of his conscience, that that becomes evident in his will. The will is that what takes place in the body as a result of that what is consciousness and conscience. And for that as long

as man is on earth his body will become the executor of that what he thinks and feels. When he now thinks and feels objectively, that what he can do is done in such a way that it is applicable in accordance with the wisdom he has and in the proper relationship of that what is just.

Consciousness and conscience mean that for a man when he is acting, that is when he is manifesting in a certain way with his body, that that what he does is in accordance with absolute values and not with the values which at the present time exist on earth.

Maybe I should leave it at this point because it becomes already much too difficult if I make you more and more confused. And if there are certain things out of this that you really would like to elucidate on, it is much easier to remain simple. Yeah.

Question: When you were talking about the beginning of the development of the little "I", you said that (I believe you said) that its chief function was to observe and not to try to change what it observes. But Ouspensky talks about beginning work very soon on negative emotions, and I don't understand the discrepancy there. Is it another part of the personality that begins the work against the negative emotions?

Mr. Nyland: No, I think that Ouspensky is a little misleading about it. When the little "I" starts to consider emotions, that is, when the little "I" has to be impartial, it has to be in a very difficult time to observe something that is completely partial. So for that reason, Ouspensky says if you only need not express your negative emotions then you can continue to observe your body without being bothered by the emotions.

Question: You observe what's happening inside but you don't give it an external expression?

Mr. Nyland: Observation has to do with that what is taking place as

manifestations of the physical body. In order to develop an "I", I try to put it in such simple conditions that I possibly can. When the requirement for observation, that is, for the acquisition of consciousness is in the first place to observe, but to observe impartially. And impartiality, to make it at the moment we call it simultaneity. This is considered the three rules, the ABC of true observation. When I want to observe that what is my body, I do not have much interference with either what I feel or what I think. Because with my body I can have manifestations to which I need not be attached and also with which I need not have any associations at all.

Question: Would this be like observing your heartbeat, or . . . ?

Mr. Nyland: No, maybe if you could, your heartbeat, but you could not make that very much continuous. There are five different ways of manifestation which are suitable for observation purposes: movements, tone of voice, facial expression, posture and gesture. All of those I can more or less become objective to because I have no desire to like or dislike my movements when I just walk back and forth in a room. Facial expression may be a certain movement of the muscles of the face but I do know that I have different expressions on my face to which I also could become impartial, simply stating the fact that it is there without any wish to change it. Whenever I now start to become so-called observant, of processes of a feeling kind, the little "I" has to remain objective, it has to remain impartial when it observes that what is the source of partiality. It has a hard time doing it.

Question: The emotional center is the source of partiality?

Mr. Nyland: That's right, because that is where I like and dislike. Whenever I wish to observe in accordance with a moment and I now try to observe that what is a mental function, it is difficult for the little "I" to record it at the moment when it actually happens because

my ordinary mind is filled with associations. My ordinary mind lives that what is going to take place in the future - that what will become the present and then disappears into the past. My mental functions have to do with future and past and is never recording anything at the present. Because ~~xx~~ it's incapable of doing it. It cannot register a moment.

Question: Incapable as we are now? Or absolutely?

Mr. Nyland: As we are now, no, no, no, as we are now. It has to be taught how to register a moment of existence. We live in memory and we live in anticipation and ordinary mind although theoretically, to the future from the past has to go through the present, it goes too fast, and we don't register then until immediately after an event has happened; it has become memory. And memory can be sharp, but there is always a little time elapsed. And that time is exactly what prevents me from registering at the moment. That little time element is used for association processes in my mind. So you see when I want now to develop "I", I have to put it in such conditions that are most suitable for it. For that reason, for the beginning I only observe with this little "I" in a certain section ~~m~~ of my brain that what are the manifestations of the physical body.

Question: Oh, you don't even try to observe emotions (word not understood). . . ?

Mr. Nyland: Not in the beginning. Because it's bound to, to end up in disaster.

Question: There must be a point at which you begin to try to observe them . . .

Mr. Nyland: Not necessarily. Because that what is in the body is usually a vault of what I feel and what I think. You see, the other centers express themselves in that way. If my feeling is active, it

becomes apparent in a manifestation of my body. Because there is a close relationship between these two centers. And when I have a mind, and it has a thought, it may stay for a little while as a thought, but usually it becomes active in the form of a manifestation, whatever the body is doing as a result of this thought. So if I continue to observe the manifestations of the body, I will be able after some time to trace it back to what the ~~xxx~~ source was, where it came from. And in that way, indirectly, I will have a chance to observe what is taking place feelingly or what is taking place in an intellectual sense by the observation of the physical body only. I do it (word not understood) that because the little "I" is not strong enough in the ~~gm~~ beginning.

Now if it is fullgrown, that is, when it has actual capacity of retaining that what is objective to "I" in the presence of all forms of subjectivity. I don't ~~xxx~~ mind when I know how to observe and this particular dexterity has been acquired, that I change, as it were, the object of my observation. And instead of having the object being my physical body I can put under it as if it is at the end of a telescope, I put under it my emotional states. Or my emotion actually taking place as a result of whatever takes place as rates of vibrations in my solar plexus. And I even could then have the telescope be directed towards mental processes when the "I" is fullgrown enough not to be affected by that what it is seeing.

Question: This would take years.

Mr. Nyland: Of course it will take a long time. That is why Guspensky in order to, let's say, adapt himself a little bit to that, thinks that it is very necessary to suppress negative emotions.

Question: Do you agree with him?

Mr. Nyland: No, I don't. Because it is an extremely dangerous process.

If I suppress them, and I'm not awake, there is a quantity of emotional energy which is then not expressed, and it has to find a different form. And where will it go? When it is really an emotional quality, and it is full of energy, it will create all kinds of other psychological states. It's only useful when there is already the possibility of using such energy for a possible development of something that does not exist now. So when I'm awake there are three different possibilities of utilization of energy. And this energy being of an emotional kind should go to the development of an emotional body. You might say when I wake up there is an opening through which this energy can flow into a different channel and instead of remaining contained within my body and causing an explosion, it will actually form that what is within my body as a possibility of an emotional something that I call "Keesdjanian".

Question: Call . . . I don't know . . .

Mr. Byland: Keesdjan. Keesdjan is the name Gurdjieff uses for the emotional body. Keesdjan; body Keesdjan, body soul and body physical: these are the three bodies that Gurdjieff talks about. If you want a schematic in a certain form as of a diagram, that what takes place in a physical octave flows over at a horizontal line directing unconscious from conscious into the formation at the top of the Keesdjanian body. But I don't want to bother too much about diagrams. At least, in a state of being awake, in the state of awareness continued as the state of awakening, then there is a possibility of opening a utilization of this form of energy. Then it has a good purpose. Then if I wish to suppress my negative emotions and if I could remain awake it would be wonderful. But what is needed for the suppression of my negative emotions it is going contrary, completely contrary, to my ordinary habitual way of behavior. And it will require an enormous amount of attention even to suppress it enough to show it. As a result, that what is needed for

the maintenance of "I" gets very little energy. Because there's only a total amount of energy that's available to me at any one time. And I cannot increase it that easily. I cannot at such a time pray to God that he's to give me a little more extra energy. I have to do with what I have. If 90% goes into the suppression of the negative emotion, 10% is not enough for the maintenance of "I". So I'm at a loss. The result is, and it's idiotic, Guspensky never did it.

Question: (Laughter). And Gurdjieff never taught it?

Mr. Nyland: No, of course not. Gurdjieff says "undesirable emotions". He talks about that, meaning by that, that in certain emotional forms of manifestations a great deal of energy is lost with no purpose whatsoever. From that standpoint it's undesirable. But he does not say don't, don't express them. He says, "Wake up!". When you wake up to yourself and can consider whatever it is as manifestation, and a manifestation may be a result of an emotional state. But if I can accept that for whatever it is without wishing to change it

Question: In fact it changes . . . ?

Mr. Nyland: Of course it will change, but I do not wish it to change. That is what makes the difference.

Question: You mean you don't will it to change . . . ?

Mr. Nyland: You leave it alone and all you wish is to wake up. In the state of being awake, one is in an entirely different condition. And in that awakened state, that what is energy is distributed in an entirely different way from ordinary unconsciousness. . . . (One moment). It is as if, when one wakes up, that what is taking place in man is under the influence of the sun, as consciousness, now being in contact with the condition comparable to snow . . . snow.

Question: Snow?

Mr. Nyland: Snow must melt when the sun shines on it. Unconsciousness

must change when consciousness is present because consciousness has more value than unconsciousness. That what is higher must affect the lower. It's very simple. Yeah.

Question: I seem to be able to follow you to the extent that the similarity between Gurdjieff and Hume . . . what Hume has to say about developing a consciousness. Do you find a similarity yourself?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I think there is something that is similar and also I don't think that Hume emphasizes impartiality.

Question: Impartiality in what way?

Mr. Nyland: Impartiality. That one becomes impartial to whatever one's behavior is. And I think that's the crux of the matter because if there is not impartiality, if it is continuation of partiality, it remains subjective.

Question: Well, Hume has this confrontation with the shadow, and one must be impartial when observing the shadow . . . and uh . . .

Mr. Nyland: That's right . . . but you see the shadow is not a manifestation. The shadow goes along with the body, but it is not . . .

Question: But to observe objectively, one must do the same thing.

Mr. Nyland: Yes. But the shadow doesn't help you to look at the manifestations of yourself and then in the shadow much of the manifestation is gone. The shadow is not a personality.

Question: Well, I haven't read Gurdjieff. I'll have to do it.

Mr. Nyland: Alright, but what I simply mean is whenever there is an observation of man as he is he gets stuck on the manifestations. That he sees of himself which he sometimes does not like. And his process of rationalization takes place. That that what is there - he puts a little water in the wine and he does not want to face it.

Question: I think man is capable of observing the shadow if the little "I" or the creative (word not understood) or the center of the self

begins to work.

Mr. Nyland: If he were - right. . . . That's right. When it is not an extension, when it is not an expansion of his brain as it is at the present time. Something new has to be introduced which we call objectivity because out of the 100% subjectivity, by its own development to its highest point of development, it will never become objective.

There are different states of levels of being, the same way as there is between ordinary sleep and the waking-sleeping state. There has to be the same kind of a difference of the introduction of something that is different from the level where one is going to the level where one wants to go. It's exactly the same structure as in an atom. Whenever you have different rings around a nucleus, each ring is complete in itself. To go from one ring to the other you need a quantum. In this case the quantum that is being used is objectivity as a new concept entering into the level of being which is higher.

Question: One has the will and the hope and the need . . . ?

Mr. Nyland: No, the question is one first has to develop a faculty that becomes more permanent for oneself and is more objective. And one uses that as a steppingstone to develop oneself further, ultimately to be change that what is now subjective into objectivity as a whole. The beginning of the little "I". When it returns to, you might say, to earth to help, we call it participation, that is to be present in the activities of man as manifestation. Then because of its condition as consciousness, will start to affect the unconscious state in which man is. And that if in the mind there is an objective faculty in a certain section of the brain, it will start to affect the rest of the brain as soon as the rest of the brain does not see any danger in being in contact with something that is of higher quality. It starts to

spread then like yeast but it has to have the quality of objectivity instead of subjectivity. You don't get that by means of the shadow.

Question: You don't get that by means of what?

Mr. Nyland: The shadow.

Question: Oh, the shadow. Is there such a thing as reincarnation?

Mr. Nyland: Of course there is.

Question: In Gurdjieff?

Mr. Nyland: Of course there is. Naturally there has to be.

Question: I have several questions, but one of them is this: uh, when the little "I" is formed to what extent he is, uh, conscious of it being, or having objective experiences. That's one question. I think all of them are related and that some point [enoughing, unclear] that what has to be done and what is just . . . that means that there are cosmic laws that have to be followed. Now, if, uh, most of the people just, uh, are born and they die and they don't develop any "I's", are they following the cosmic laws too? Or the real cosmic laws are to try to form ~~the~~ this "I", real objective "I"?

Mr. Nyland: What we are talking about is a certain way almost like a shortcut. As if this kind of work functions as a catalyzer. It does not mean that man, in his ordinary development provided he has enough experiences, lives long enough, finally becomes, to a certain extent at least, objective. The ~~xxxxxx~~ reason is that when he keeps on re-creating his own experiences he will lose interest and he will know already what is taking place and that means he becomes impartial to that what is happening. To a man who has sufficient maturity and who could live really much longer than we live, but as old as Methuselah, he would automatically become a conscious man. But there is ~~xxx~~ no man at the present time. So we need something that catalyzes this kind of re-creative reaction. It speeds it up. All of this is to introduce a certain element which in itself is not affected by the reaction. But simply

by its mere presence proceeds in such a way that it activates the reaction. The little "I", when it starts to function that way, remains undamaged but nevertheless because of its presence it has an effect.

Question: The other question has to do with the man freedom a developed being may have to go backwards or to disappear if he wants to.

Mr. Nyland: It all depends on how far he is if he actually can disappear. If he has life, and life is now contained in his physical body, he is bound by his physical body and because of that, bound to earth. If he could actually have his life live in an emotional body which is less dense, he could disappear from earth and live somewhere else away from it. It's a question of density. And it's a question of definition. That is, if I consider emotions of a different kind of quality although they may be material, certainly could be in a less dense form as if there's air. Air can disappear from the earth; it's not bound because it has a life. So if the form of life that I now represent is now represented in me and to which I need my body as a form, if that life can continue to exist in a form which is less dense, I can fly away.

What happens to the spiritual development of man after the physical body dies? It's a quality of life of man that remains in existence. And we say go into the spiritual world or in any event to a certain realm which is not earthly. He loses bondage of earth. He does not lose form. It still is a form. Magnetism is a form of energy which for us is not dependent, many times not dependent on space; it may be dependent a little bit on distance. But nevertheless can exert at a distance a certain effect. And it does not need the form we have now even if we can bring it down to earth by using electric current in a coil[?]oid, we would have magnetic force. But I can't conceive of magnetic force existing without any force if I understand what is

meant by a force field (?). Yes?

Question: Question back to your "I", again. Uh, I keep seeing, uh, you get off to one side and look at yourself, the parts of your personality, not your personality, but your body that you can look at without being too upset, but uh, how do you keep from playing the same record over and over again?

Mr. Nyland: I think it has to be done: play it over and over again.

Question: Getting out of that rut, though . . .

Mr. Nyland: No, there is no rut, because your manifestations change. All that remains is the "I" that trying to keep on observing you as you manifest differently. So there is enough variation in the record. You see, the little "I", if I assume that it continues to exist constantly will have different manifestations of myself. If "I" as manifestation of (?) as absolutely quiet and so forth, I think little "I" would go home because there's nothing to be found. But I continue to change as I am as a personality, and I manifest all the time in some way or other simply because I happen to remain, so-called, in existence. Although it may be unconscious it is a representation of that what I call my body, and "I" is only interested in the existence of my body, not describing it and not wishing to change it, not having anything to do with it. It isn't even interested in how it is. It isn't interested in why it happens to be the way it is. It's only interested in the existence; only in that way it can remain pure.

I would suggest that you read if you're really interested. Find out what Gurdjieff has to say. Gurdjieff is no fool. I think it is very, very interesting to find out that here is something that is described; that actually you could put to practice and for yourself could make your own. It is not a doctrine which you have to accept simply because someone else tells you. It is quite definitely some-

thing that is brought down to the level of ordinary human beings where they could develop this little "I" and then see if to some extent they become more or less conscious. Or if it has a very definite effect on them physiologically. Or maybe it will give them more insight and wisdom. Or maybe it ~~will~~ make them more alert. It is not at all a repetition of what one has already done, and looks at it and tries to understand it that way like many times of course we accumulate facts of the past. This has to do with as you are now and the constant change of now as present which constantly changes as present, but remains as a principle of presence, is something entirely different. And I'm sometimes amazed that people don't even understand what Gurdjieff means.

Because in ordinary logic, in ordinary religion, if you're familiar with any comparative religions of different forms, if you are interested in whatever may be in existence for you as Buddhism or Zen or concepts in which the moment quite definitely is used as instantaneity, of that what really is man as he is in all truth without having any interpretation which is furnished by his ordinary mind. The acceptance and belief that mind as it is now is limited of course is nothing unusual about it, it is stupid sometimes; it doesn't even know what to think. That man is mechanical and is absolutely incapable sometimes of doing what he should do, that there is a constant conflict in man between mind and feeling and that sometimes he doesn't know what to do and what to follow, there's no homogeneity in man; it is all the time that what pulls him one way or the other.

And particularly if you take these as forces through which each man is influenced, by which each man is influenced, the form that what drags him down, and that what makes him aspire to a higher level, whatever it is that man considers on earth to be of value to him, and the constant changes that will take place the more he so-called

lives and becomes mature and that every time he now starts out and accumulates a lot of data about himself, that after some time he has to change his mind and he doesn't know actually what to think because ten years from now it may be different again.

It is all the time this question of personal interpretation about oneself, and it is of course something that man suffers under, and the same way that science or some kind of an art form suffers. Because all the time personality enters into it. And although it is interesting and it remains beautiful, it does not mean it gives you absolute value. Absoluteness means that everybody agrees without exception. That's the idea of objectivity. The elimination of all subjective forms. And for that reason it is necessary to assemble that kind of a language. As long as you talk subjectivity in the language, you run the risk of course that no one will understand you, or that perhaps just a few understand you.

(Unintelligible word) there's a life entity in man to free himself, and that the purpose of man ultimately is to become free and he may or not have a chance to do it in his lifetime. And that for that reason he may have to reincarnate in order to have, you might call it, advantages of having to work on earth in some form or other.

Question: Well, you, uh, don't have much proof of that.

Mr. Nyland: I think one has . . .

Question: It's an old, old concept . . . but uh, there is (unclear).

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, sure. Do we have much proof of God existing?

Question: No, I don't mean that, but I mean the laws of inheritance also, uh, it seems to me a better explanation of, uh, that we might inherit the spirit as well as the physical characteristics in the chromosomes and uh . . . so on, and . . .

Mr. Nyland: Yes, to some extent . . .

Question: And this doesn't bring on reincarnation; it brings on just the law of inheritance.

Mr. Nyland: The question . . .

Question: This is not proved either, but nevertheless, uh, the collective unconscious that Jung speaks of is very similar and that we are made up of more than one, uh . . .

Mr. Nyland: I think that we're made up of many things at the present time. I think that how life started to exist as it created me simply means that there was some form of life somewhere which was already in a certain condition. To what extent it was mixed at that time with spiritual values I don't know. But I find out for myself the only thing that I can know and verify for myself. And therefore when I now try to work as it were, try to free that what I consider life, I become to some extent attached to that. So I start from there. Then I wish to retain it and keep at it because I worked for it; I'm not going to give it up. You might say that if I actually deserve credit, if I ever would meet God afterwards and he asked me how much have you worked, that I could show I worked for my living.

Now if I become attached, that is, I become identified to a certain extent to that what I have started to continue, and this is now the state of a difference between unconsciousness and consciousness, I will accept everything that I now become aware of of myself which exists --- spiritual values or whatever it may be or whatever form it is; and although I cannot immediately trace where it came from I can become acquainted with what is now. Then logically, if I then want to hang on to that what I've started naturally I want to have something that can continue to exist after my physical body dies. Then I must come to the concept that that form of life now representing me continues to exist. Now when I consider that it exists after I die I have to (?)

that it must have existed before. There's no other way. So I will include that that what I find myself as now containing spiritual values or any kind of a value that I either call my personality or that if it is grown out sufficiently it could become individuality for me. That that of course has always existed in some kind of a form, and it will then agree with laws of karma or whatever may be that has happened before I actually appeared on the earth. I do not know very much about it, but nobody does. And I'd simply take that what is most logical for me again as a working hypothesis until it is shown to me that perhaps it is not workable, and that I have forgotten something. After I die and I continue to exist and I live in a different realm, I may find out certain things that I cannot possibly find out now. And because of that if I'm still interested in the continuation of work on myself in order to free myself, I will probably have to change my ideas about what I am. Which is I'm perfectly willing to face it as long as I say it is not as yet absolute because I'm still an ordinary human being.

If I would claim to be God then of course I would be omniscient then naturally I would not assume any more. I'm trying to learn to know because I'm still on the road and probably for a very long time. Question: Does the, uh, business of going to feed the moon when one dies Guspensky speaks of . . .

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think in general humanity as a whole is here on earth in order to maintain the place of earth where it is and that in according to the allegory of Gurdjieff, that when the moon was split off and Anulius as part of the moon, as a result of a certain catastrophe, simply meant that for man, when he was born, he then in a certain, what is called for him an Transapalnian Perturbation, he loses something of himself and becomes then as manifestation as if it

is a reflection of his consciousness. This is the idea of earth that together with this something was split off in the form of the moon and Anulius which retains in man that what is he as manifestation and that what becomes for him gradually his essential essence which in the terminology of Gurdjieff is his Magnetic Center. So that actually the reason why man wishes to create an "I" comes from the fact that he realizes at certain times that life in him is of value which has to be maintained, and he calls that his Magnetic Center.

For that reason it's magnetic, that because of life it wishes to be united again with the totality of existing. And that only temporarily he happens to have this life in him and is represented as a human being. And that therefore the desire on the part of Magnetic Center to become free, it is as if it is in prison and then wants to create a little helper outside in the form of the little "I", so that the door always was open. You see the moon has that function.

Question: I see

Mr. Nyland: But the moon remains reflected light. So the problem for man is to see that what was his manifestation physically which for him in ordinary unconscious state is the prime source of his movements, that is he considers that the positive element and that what is his intellect is negative. There's a change of heart on the part of man when he works; it's a transformation of that what is now positive becoming negative; that is his body being positive becomes negative, that his mind which is negative becomes positive, and that then man as such being conscious has a proper relationship between that what is his mind, his consciousness, his conscience, and his body. And his body then becomes nothing else but the servant in the, in what you might say, in the service of "I": to execute that what is required in accordance with the law of consciousness.

and the law of conscience, not with the law of body.

Question: And it's chiefly allegoric?

Mr. Nyland: Yes of course, all of that. But ultimately it becomes quite practical.

Question: What do you suggest to read?

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I think In Search of the Miraculous is very good if you don't read too much of it. And if you want to skip the things that look a little funny. . .

(Laughter)

There are many things in it that are very nice for different people and some of the diagrams are a little mathematical - hydrogens and so forth I would skip. But I think it is nice as a little introduction. The real book you have to read, of course, is All and Everything BECAUSE because why go to Ouspensky.

Question: That's an allegory isn't it?

Mr. Nyland: Oh yes, but it's quite practical. It's a lovely story. Very interesting.

Question: What can you read to get the concepts that you're giving now?

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think they are hidden in All and Everything.

~~XXXXXXXX~~ The best way to get a concept is to go to a group where they talk about it.

Question: Go to what?

Mr. Nyland: Go to some group where they talk about such concepts. There is very little available of the kind of literature because it belongs to a certain form of esoteric knowledge. And it is not to be given to the general public unless one really knows a little bit of what one is. The first Series, as Gurdjieff calls All and Everything is only to give a man an impartial criticism of what he actually is.

And the second series is in order to build up to show that there are possibilities of that kind of a consciousness even in the representations of certain people who have lived on earth. And the third series which, according to reports, might be published, and if they are published in the regular form so that it is available to the public as a whole, I think it is a serious mistake. If it is published within the limited group of people, you might say, who deserve it, or who would be ready for that kind of information, it would be quite useful.

Question: Is it available to groups?

Mr. Nyland: It will be, I think, after it has been published. I'm afraid however that it may be published and be on the market and then also I think it will do a great deal of damage.

Question: What kind of damage do you think it will do?

Mr. Nyland: Premature knowledge which is no good and will act as a poison.

Question: You mean it will be deliberately misused?

Mr. Nyland: No, it will be fed to people so that they then think they know. You know nothing is wrong with knowledge as it is, only it depends on who gets it when. If I in my youth became interested in Egypt and as a high school boy I have to write a little essay on the pyramids, whenever afterwards somebody will mention the pyramids, I will say, "Oh yes, I know all about it". You know, it is idiotic, but that is the case.

Question: I would like to ask you, uh, uh, what are your views on, on, on life on another plane. I, I very often wondered, uh, I don't think everybody reincarnates, uh, they have to come from someplace, and uh, uh sometimes after reading a book, this writer will mention, uh, after being in communication with spirit or whatever might call it,

that they claim that their heaven alive is very similar to life on this earth . . . Could you tell me your views on this?

Mr. Nyland: Yes. I do not know to what extent it is similar to life on earth. I think when we receive information of that kind we always interpret it in the terminology that we are familiar with. You know, if I think of God, I love to put Him on the throne as an old man sitting there guarding the universe. Of course it cannot be God, it can never be that kind of a concept. When I at the same time have to admit that that one of the attributes is that is on earth. So I have to bring it down to a level where my mind can understand it. And if I make it too vague it cannot be understood by everybody. So when I think of the spiritual world I assume that they are more or less like we are; in reality they are not because the spiritual world, the concept of that is based on an emotional quality and I cannot conceive at the present time what is emotion without manifestation of my physical body. It is only very seldom that I will admit that in certain deeper emotions like religiousness or like love that actually affects me in my heart, that I still need certain forms in order to bring it down to my level of understanding, but to take it as an emotional quality exchanged between people only on an emotional level, it is extremely difficult to keep that because I will want to explain it, formulate it, intellectualize about it or I want to express it physically.

You see, so if I talk about physical existence and spiritual existence I like to equate it and I do damage to the spiritual world if I do. Simply because if I talk about this as a waking-sleeping state and that what I would like to reach is the state of being awake, I try to describe what it is to be awake and then I say: yes, heaven is paved with gold. Because I don't know any better of how to express something that is extremely beautiful, but I may be very much sur-

prised that when I reach heaven that there is mud on the streets.

You see I only will know I wish to be ~~xx~~ awake when I know I'm asleep. And at most I can say I don't want to sleep. Then I would be awake. And then I will have to see what it is like when I'm awake. If I want to know about spirits I will of course have to wait until I am one. If in the meantime I can communicate with them, they have to talk our language. How else would we know? ~~A~~ So they, you might say, materialize in some form to make it understandable. And if you have higher spirits, of spirits we are not ~~xx~~ as close to earth, who live somewhere in the universe or whatever in space, they sometimes cannot communicate directly with the earth. They have to have some kind of a medium. Not of this earth I mean, but actually lower kind of spirits who then are in contact with that what is on earth.

In a spiritual world there are many levels of being and there are different spirits who have developed to a certain extent and others who have not at all. It depends entirely if they come from earth or whatever they may have suffered or experienced here. There is no question that each person in his lifetime acquires certain characteristics of a spiritual nature, dependent entirely how much he has been willing to wish to experience of that what has been weeded out of him because of the conditions in which he happens to live. Whatever it is that he has spent as emotional expenditure in order to reach something that was worthwhile for him, or that he has lived a life for which he didn't care very much and remains very superficial.

Logically that what he is when he dies and what remains of him as a spiritual value must have the qualifications of where it came from because it was born from there. As far as the levels of spiritual existence are concerned, there is of course absolutely no reason to assume that the earth is the only place where there is living men.

It must be all over if I understand life as infinity. But again this concept is unfamiliar to me because I'm constantly troubled by all kind of forms, and I cannot free myself from manifestations, and whenever I want to express it I have to do some form of work or even music, and I cannot be silent and still communicate. When can one learn (7) and to that extent can learn how to be spiritual.

Audience: I wonder if we could have a short break now and then we'll come back in about ten minutes or so.

Mr. Nyland: How's that break there . . .

Audience: About fifteen minutes then. Are there other questions?

Mr. Nyland: Are there really? Okay? Fine. Let's stop.

and

TAPE M 1362, Tuesday, February 27, 1968

CALIFORNIA SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL STUDY, BERKELEY

Mr. Nyland: Well, if we don't want it to be too late. I am perfectly willing to answer a few more questions if there are any, or if you are interested in some other aspects.

Question: How do you understand in the words of _____, the big "I" you see it as something quite singular, as an integration of the many, or something quite other?

Mr. Nyland: No. It is really quite other, and in order to bring it back again to knowledge, for oneself that one can more or less fathom that is within the framework. The beginning of little "I" is the part of an intellectual body which starts to exist. You see if "I" has to be observant and objective, the observation process means something mental and must take place and for the time being - when I say the little "I", it starts with the do of the intellectual octave, so that the "I" goes thru certain developments which have to do with observation in the proper sense, as remaining impartial and as being subject to the law of simultaneity, that then the next step in that development in accordance with the do, re, mi of that scale would be re. The note re indicates that the "I" has sufficiently grown up to be able to utilize what it now knows and what it has as knowledge for the purpose of helping man as he is whose "I" he is, -i.e., to whom he belongs. Each "I" becomes individual for each person. In principal, all "I's" are the same because they represent a form of life outside of the manifestation of man, to some extent each man when he wishes to create his "I" creates "I" in God's

Must Remain in
Transcription Room

image to the extent that he understands God, or atleast thinks that he knows , so that the quality of "I", being now objective is for man, as if God is looking at him from the standpoint of Heaven accepting that what he is, as God's child. But then, God's child, not knowing exactly what to do with this life, so the note in this octave what we call participation, and the little "I" full-grown more or less, that is having the ability, has to test its ability to see if it is actual, and it does that ^{by} being present to the manifestations of man in an unconscious state to see if this little "I" has enough wisdom to help him overcome or to solve certain problems. This participation problem means that whenever man in an unconscious state, with his unconscious mind, does certain things-- a certain quality of objectivity is introduced next to it. And that then the judgment is in accordance with objective rules and not subjective rules. You see-- it is gradually the spreading of that what is the "I" in an intellectual sense. If it is located in part of the brain - that like yeast, it starts to spread over the totality of the brain as it is and changes it and converts it into an objective, possibility of mental function.

Question: That is one way of putting it ,but then think of the terms of the rules, as it is given by Gurdjieff in the Eastern sense, that is the idea of the house--- the house that has no master, the servants that are running about doing the tasks that are not appointed.

Mr. Nyland: That is Ouspensky, not Gurdjieff. It's not Gurdjieff.

It's quite ^{all} right if one can apply it.

Question: All right, then if the master is present, then how about the

